

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 10-14 are now pending in the application. Claims 4, 8, 9 and 15 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-12, 13 and 14 are currently amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The Examiner stated that the IDS submitted on October 11, 2004 is not fully in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.98. Applicants contend that this application has entered the National Phase and the references, which were cited on the International Search Report prepared by the Japanese Patent Office, should have been provided under the Trilateral Agreement. However, in order to expedite this process, Applicants are enclosing a new Information Disclosure Statement with the references not accepted by the Examiner along with a copy of each reference. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **SPECIFICATION**

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant(s) have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS / MINOR INFORMALITIES / IMPROPER DEPENDENT**

The claims stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant(s) have amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the revisions made per the Examiner's suggestions.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soules et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,405). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Soules et al. (USP 5,959,405) fails to disclose the element of Claims 13 and 14, "the diameter  $D_c$  of a portion positioned on the side opposite to the opening section of the recessed portion is greater than the diameter of a portion corresponding to virtually the center portion of the recessed portion in the longitudinal direction of the excitation coil." The effect obtained from the element is described on page 30, lines 13-18 of the specification.

The aforementioned element refers to the comparison between the diameter of the top of the recessed portion and that of the center portion of the recessed portion.


However, the Examiner seems to misinterpret the diameter of the center portion of the recessed portion as the diameter of the center portion of the coil. To assist the Examiner, annotated copies of Applicants' Fig. 14 and the Soules figure are enclosed herewith.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: January 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory A. Stobbs  
Registration No.: 28,764  
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1214  
Attorney for Applicant